MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
HELD IN WASHINGTON, D. C., JUNE 9, 1939

The 10th meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts during the fiscal year 1939 was held in its office in the Interior Department Building on Friday, June 9, 1939. The following members were present:

Mr. Clarke, Chairman,
Mr. Borie,
Mr. Savage,
Mr. Shepley,
Mr. Lamb,
Mr. Manship,
also H. P. Caemmerer,

Secretary and Administrative Officer.

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 a. m.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PRECEDING MEETING: The Minutes of the Meeting held April 21, 1939, were approved.

2. JEFFERSON COFFEE URN: The Chairman brought to the attention of the Commission the following letter received from Miss Amelia L. von Mayhoff, offering a silver coffee urn that once belonged to Thomas Jefferson:

7 East 89th Street,
New York, N. Y.
May 4th 1939

Dear Mr. Clarke:

As I have the silver coffee urn of Thomas Jefferson, which he used so many years, Mrs. Roosevelt, at the White House has very kindly advised me to refer to you, in regard to the disposal of it. I enclose the correct description of it, trusting greatly you may be able to dispose of it, with the proper inclusive commission. With regards and appreciation of your courtesy,

Sincerely,
Amelia L. von Mayhoff
(Per E. P. A.)

The Commission recommended that the urn be brought to the attention of the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Foundation for display at Monticello. (Exhibit A)

MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
HELD IN WASHINGTON, D. C., JUNE 9, 1939

The 10th meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts during the fiscal year 1939 was held in its office in the Interior Department Building on Friday, June 9, 1939. The following members were present:

Mr. Clarke, Chairman.
Mr. Borie.
Mr. Savage.
Mr. Shopley.
Mr. Lamb.
Mr. Manship.

also

Secretary and Administrative Officer.

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 a. m.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PRECEDING MEETING: The Minutes of the Meeting held April 21, 1939, were approved.

2. JEFFERSON COUNTRY URN: The Chairman brought to the attention of the Commission the following letter received from Miss Amelia L. von Meyhoff, offering a silver coffee urn that once belonged to Thomas Jefferson:

7 East 69th Street,
New York, N. Y.
May 4th 1939

Dear Mr. Clarke:

As I have the silver coffee urn of Thomas Jefferson, which he used so many years, Mrs. Roosevelt, at the White House has very kindly advised me to refer to you, in regard to the disposal of it. I enclose the correct description of it, trusting greatly you may be able to dispose of it, with the proper Inclusive commission.

With regards and appreciation of your courtesy.

Sincerely,
Amelia L. von Meyhoff
(Per E. P. A.)

The Commission recommended that the urn be brought to the attention of the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Foundation for display at Monticello. (Exhibit A)

3. PAINTING, THE SIGNING OF THE CONSTITUTION: The Secretary reported that Mr. David Lynn, Architect of the Capitol, had stated that Speaker Bankhead had authorized him to say that by unanimous vote the Commission appointed by Congress for procuring the painting, "The Signing of the Constitution", had unanimously selected Howard Chandler Christy for the work.

The Commission expressed regret that this award was not made through a competition. The Chairman called attention to a protest received from Mr. Arthur Emptage, National Executive Secretary, American Artists' Congress, New York City, as follows:

June 3rd, 1939

Fine Arts Commission
New Department of Interior Building
Washington, D. C.

Gentlemen:

In the name of nine hundred American artists of standing we wish to protest against the awarding of a $30,000 art commission without holding an open competition.

We refer to the mural to be placed in the Capitol Building in Washington depicting the signing of the Constitution of the United States.

We consider it undemocratic and unfair for Congress to make such an award without a competition and we respectfully ask that this whole matter be reconsidered and made available to all those artists in the United States capable of carrying out the work.

Respectfully,
(Signed) Arthur Emptage,
National Executive Secretary.

In reply to that letter the Chairman sent a copy of the letter that was sent by the Commission to Speaker Bankhead relative to the proposed painting. (Exhibit B)

4. DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA LIBRARY: Five designs that had been submitted by Mr. Wyeth for treatment of the facade for the new District of Columbia Library

to face Pennsylvania Avenue were considered by the architect members of the Commission. Mr. Borie reported:

> If there must be two doors I prefer #2. If one entrance, I prefer sketch #5 (with minor details as shown).

Mr. Lamb reported:

> I have also received from you a few days ago the sketches for the Library Building. I have no particular comments to make on these, as the drawings are very much in the sketch form. I agree, however, that getting a stronger projection in the facade is very desirable. I think of the five sketches submitted the schemes Nos. 1, 2 or 3 are preferable and that the sketches 4 and 5 are somewhat confused. I presume there will be a discussion on this building at our meeting on the 9th of June.
>
> Sincerely yours,
> (Signed) Wm. F. Lamb.

Mr. Shepley reported:

> Regarding the different schemes you sent me for Mr. Wyeth's Central Public Library, I would prefer the tall windows in an unbroken row as they are in schemes 1 and 3 rather than having them interrupted by smaller windows as in the other schemes.
>
> As for the organization of the masses on the Pennsylvania Avenue elevation, I prefer Sketch #5 but I would connect vertically the two smaller windows either side of the central motive, and do the same with the similar windows at the east and west ends of the facade.
>
> I also think it would be possible to carry the cornice through the central motive as indicated on the sketch I enclose which I accidentally tore in half.
>
> Sincerely yours,
> (Signed) Henry R. Shepley.

The designs were then fully discussed by the Commission with a view to coming to an agreement on one design.

Mr. Wyeth submitted an additional design showing a long projection for the structure, 26 feet back from the curb. He stated that this had received the approval of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission and was thought by that Commission to be very good since such a building would not restrict the width of new buildings on Pennsylvania Avenue west of Sixth Street.

to face Pennsylvania Avenue were considered by the architect member of the Commission. Mr. Borie reported:

If there must be two doors I prefer #3. If one entrance, I prefer sketch #5 (with minor details as shown).

Mr. Lamb reported:

I have also received from you a few days ago the sketches for the Library Building. I have no particular comments to make on these, as the drawings are very much in the sketch form. I agree, however, that getting a stronger projection in the facade is very desirable. I think of the five sketches submitted the schemes Nos. 1, 2 or 3 are preferable and that the sketches 4 and 5 are somewhat confused. I presume there will be a discussion on this building at our meeting on the 9th of June.

Sincerely yours,
(Signed) Wm. F. Lamb.

Mr. Shepley reported:

Regarding the different schemes you sent me for Mr. Wyeth's Central Public Library, I would prefer the tall windows in an unbroken row as they are in schemes 1 and 3 rather than having them interrupted by smaller windows as in the other schemes.

As for the organization of the masses on the Pennsylvania Avenue elevation, I prefer Sketch #5 but I would connect vertically the two smaller windows either side of the central motive, and do the same with the similar windows at the east and west ends of the facade.

I also think it would be possible to carry the cornice through the central motive as indicated on the sketch I enclose which I accidentally tore in half.

Sincerely yours,
(Signed) Henry R. Shepley.

The designs were then fully discussed by the Commission with a view to coming to an agreement on one design.

Mr. Wyeth submitted an additional design showing a long projection for the structure, 26 feet back from the curb. He stated that this had received the approval of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission and was thought by that Commission to be very good since such a building would not restrict the width of new buildings on Pennsylvania Avenue west of Sixth Street.

The Commission decided that the facade of the Library Building must be considered on its own merit and that a projection must be examined in its relation to the rest of the building. The Commission were strongly of the opinion that a projection of the length proposed by the National Capital Park and Planning Commission would be inappropriate. The Commission thereupon noted on a plot plan a projection on a reduced scale. The Commission felt that the library building on the square between Fourth and Sixth Streets would not affect the appearance of buildings on Pennsylvania Avenue west of Sixth Street.

Mr. Wyeth was asked to explain the interior scheme of the building. He said there is a central lobby at the entrance and there are staircases and small service rooms on the sides. Reading rooms are in back, as also upstairs. From the point of view of planning, the arrangements meet with the approval of the library authorities.

The architect members of the Commission then considered the facade in matters of detail. Mr. Shepley felt that there are too many motifs in the facade and that the building looks restless; in this Mr. Borie and Mr. Lamb concurred. Mr. Lamb objected to the big piers and said there are too many elements in the facade.

A report was sent to Mr. Wyeth embodying the recommendation of the Commission. (Exhibit C) Mr. Wyeth advised that he would have a new design made for submission at the next meeting of the Commission on June 23.

5. WASHINGTON NATIONAL AIRPORT: The Commission considered with Mr. Toms, Engineer of the Bureau of Public Roads, a plan for the relocation of the Mt. Vernon Highway west of the Public Roads Laboratory Buildings in connection with a study for the layout of the Washington National Airport at Gravelly Point.

Mr. Toms pointed out the fact that the main approach to the Airport is from Washington but that there will also be an approach from the direction of Alexandria. The scheme as drawn takes into consideration the existing topography in its relation to the Mount Vernon Highway and the Bureau of Public Roads Laboratories. Mr. Toms said the Procurement Division is working out a scheme for the location of the buildings and that their plans showed a wide take-off from the overpass with a border road along the Mount Vernon Highway to service the Airport. Mr. Toms said the service road would destroy the scenery along the Mount Vernon Highway because it would be another roadway adjacent to the highway, in fact, so close that it would give less room for planting a screen. He said the aeronautics authorities propose to build hangars in the northeast section of the development against the hillside. They want to do this to get about 700,000 cubic yards of dry dirt needed for grading, but to allow this would seriously affect the appearance of that locality. He said they want to dig into the hillside without regard to the effect it may have on the ultimate utilization of the property. Locating the hangars there and cutting down the hill is one way of getting dry dirt. For future expansion, to meet private needs, provision is made for commercial hangars at the south end of the airport property.

Mr. John Nolen, Director of Planning of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, thereupon presented a scheme that had been prepared in the office of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission. Mr. Nolen said it included major recommendations of the other schemes as placing the two points of entrance to the Airport from Washington and the other from Alexandria on axis but independently operated. He said this is based on the theory of having separate exits and entrances because of the desire to go south and north independently and also the desire to handle traffic more expeditiously. The hangars would be placed at an angle to the northeast slope of the hill instead of at

right angles and would be as inconspicuous as possible. A service entrance to the Airport can be provided by the extension of Twenty-third Street South; this would overpass the railroad and underpass the Mount Vernon Highway. Back of the hangars would be a retaining wall 15 feet high.

The Commission felt that the great question is the appearance of the Airport and its buildings from Washington; and secondly the treatment of the existing topography in the vicinity of Gravelly Point. While the Civil Aeronautics Authority have a great Airport in mind they should not be allowed to build their structures in any way they wish. The Commission emphasized the fact that the Mount Vernon Highway was built by Congress as a Memorial Highway to the Home and Tomb of George Washington and that therefore the Airport should be designed to fit into the landscape setting of the Mount Vernon Highway.

It was decided that the service road suggested along the Mount Vernon Highway should be eliminated. The Commission felt that the Bureau of Public Roads is most eminently qualified to make a good road layout. Mr. Clarke emphasized the fact that they have experts in road building for it is their work, and that the Civil Aeronautics Authority may be able to build airports but not good roads.

Mr. LeRoy Barton, Supervising Architect, thereupon presented informally sketches that had been thus far made for the airport buildings. He said there are two schemes: 1, that of the Civil Aeronautics Authority which proposes an administration or terminal building with a length of about 450 feet, with office rooms and glassed in waiting rooms leading to the runways. The group of buildings will resemble an airplane in shape, the wings consisting of the hangars, which will flank the central building. This central or Terminal Building should have an observation and control tower. 2, The Supervising Architect's scheme,

designed with due regard to the existing topography, is a modification of the Civil Aeronautics scheme. It proposes placing the hangars against the hill, just about as shown in the plan of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission. The hangars would be about 50 feet high, segmental in construction, with concrete ribs.

The Commission appreciated the opportunity to inspect the preliminary sketches, and suggested that the hangars should be as low as possible, also that they should be so located as not to obstruct the view of the Washington Monument. Mr. Clarke said he had much to do with laying out the Mount Vernon Highway and therefore he was anxious that the Airport not ruin the scenery of the highway. A report was sent to Colonel Barton. (Exhibit D)

6. WAR DEPARTMENT BUILDING: Colonel LeRoy Barton, Supervising Architect, submitted a revised scheme for the main facade of the War Department Building. He presented a print of the original design, which was approved by the Commission of Fine Arts last fall and said that since then there has been an additional study made, resulting in the revised scheme. Primarily this revised scheme eliminated windows in the penthouse and increased the number of floors from five to six below the first setback.

Mr. Shepley felt that the original scheme had been a good deal improved; also Mr. Lamb felt that improvement had been made in some respects but thought the attic story was not high enough. Likewise Mr. Borie agreed that the height of the parapet wall is too thin.

Mr. Simon asked if it would be possible to drop the heads of the windows and raise the cornice. "At that point we are limited by the restrictions of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission."

Mr. Clarke asked Mr. Nolen concerning this matter; Mr. Nolen replied that all the public buildings have only five stories to the first setback and that

the National Capital Park and Planning Commission desires harmony in the general mass of the buildings. Mr. Shepley, speaking for the architect members of the Commission, said there are six stories with windows and it is infinitely better to have six stories than to have five stories and a clear-story punched full of holes. Mr. Shepley thought this would give the effect of greater height and stated that an attic full of windows is terrible. Mr. Clarke said: "If you increase the wall in height from 4'11½" to 5'9" in order to get a little more height you might as well ask for 6'6". Of course, a way to solve the problem is to omit the sixth floor but it is a question whether that should govern. The Park and Planning Commission have it within their province to determine the height and mass of a building, to determine the size of the 'envelope' but the Commission of Fine Arts should have jurisdiction over what is designed within the "envelope'."

Mr. Simon stated that at a joint meeting with the National Capital Park and Planning Commission somewhat over a year ago they were given a leeway of 4'11½" over requirements. "We have exceeded that by two feet. The question is whether we can have that additional height." Mr. Nolen replied that the Park and Planning Commission had made their ruling on the basis of five window stories and not six.

Mr. Lamb suggested that the building be dropped into the ground. Mr. Underwood pointed out that they have only five steps to the first floor and as some of the ground floor is unlighted space, it is to be used for publications and storage room.

Mr. Clarke said: "I think, if I may express this opinion, we don't want to act definitely with respect to this building until the Park and Planning Commission have given their clearance as to height, which it is their province

to pass upon; would the Commission of Fine Arts go so far as to say now that the revised scheme is generally acceptable? If the Park and Planning Commission agree to the additional height, we could then discuss the matter further at the next meeting."

Mr. Underwood said if the War Department has to lose the sixth story it will be quite a penalty and at the present it might be worth considering going down deeper into the ground and seeing if they can find some compromise on the lobby. The matter of three or four steps at the entrance will not make any difference. Mr. Lamb said, speaking for the architect members of the Commission: "I think we can give them general approval but we prefer that they study the scheme further."

Mr. Clarke asked Mr. Nolen whether he would care to express an opinion as to what he thought the National Capital Park and Planning Commission would do in this matter. Mr. Nolen replied: "I think the Commission is going to be concerned about the additional story--not a question of architecture but a feeling of greater height". The Park and Planning Commission is thinking of the relationship of one building to the other. The Federal Reserve Board was held down because the plan of the Commission was for low buildings on Constitution Avenue with higher buildings in back. This War Department Building is the reverse of that except for the central portion, which is modified. This is the second highest public building. You are establishing a height here that will be above any that is liable to be built on the site for a proposed addition to the Federal Reserve Board Building. The height of this penthouse is 12 feet above the Lincoln Memorial in elevation. The Lincoln Memorial is 141 feet high. This is 153 feet.

Mr. Clarke said: "I think it is the mass of this building that is going to count and not the number of stories. Mr. Clarke asked Mr. Simon what he

proposed to place at the very top just below the elevator machinery, and Mr. Simon replied that there would be an air conditioning apparatus.

Colonel Barton urged in behalf of the Supervising Architect's office that this matter be settled as quickly as possible since they are pressed for time in their construction work. The Commission therefore decided to meet in joint session with the National Capital Park and Planning Commission on Friday morning June 23, for a discussion of this project, and with a view to making a decision as to the revised scheme.

7. NEW NAVY DEPARTMENT AND MUSEUM BUILDING: Mr. Clarke reported that on May 19th he called on President Roosevelt at the White House and during the discussion the President suggested a new Navy Department Building and Navy Museum Building, and to illustrate the location along the water front west of the War Department Building the President drew a sketch (Exhibit E). Mr. Clarke said: "As near as I get it the President wants to put the Navy Building down there at the water front back of the hill where the old Naval Hospital stands that will be removed before long. Then the President wants to connect the War and Navy Buildingswith a colonnade in front of the hill along Constitution Avenue facing the Lincoln Memorial. The hill is to be left open; the Navy Building would be standing about where Heurich's brewery is and the Navy Museum would be to the north of the Navy Building. I understand that the Park and Planning Commission does not like what the Procurement Division has proposed, namely, to cut down much of the hill, and I think we ought to go pretty slow before we approve a location for the Navy Department Building until we can have a meeting with them."

Mr. Louis Simon discussed the matter with the Commission later in the day and said that so far the Supervising Architect's office has given the matter

only tentative study, that the location along the water front has been generally agreed upon but so far only the matter of buying the land has been taken up seriously by the Procurement Division though some preliminary sketches have been made. The scheme would involve cutting down the hill somewhat but no definite action has been taken in this matter.

Mr. John Nolen, Director of Planning of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, who was present, stated that his Commission has a topographic model which he would be glad to show to the members of the Commission of Fine Arts to illustrate the location of the War Department Building, the proposed Navy Department Building along the water front and the topographic condition of the hill. Mr. Nolen pointed out that so far as the actual topography is concerned at the present time, if the Navy Building be placed at the bottom of the hill along the water front it could scarcely be seen from the War Department Building on the east side of the hill.

It was decided to discuss this matter at a joint session with the National Capital Park and Planning Commission on June 23. (On June 14, 1939 Congressman Vinson introduced H. R. 6830 proposing an expenditure of $23,466,000 for the construction of new buildings for the Navy Department in the District of Columbia. (Exhibit F))

8. NAVY AND MARINE MEMORIAL: Under date of June 6, 1939, a memorandum was submitted by Mr. A. E. Demaray, Acting Director of the National Park Service (Exhibit G), reporting efforts of the National Park Service towards adopting plans for completion of the base of the Navy and Marine Memorial in accordance with the Act of Congress on the subject, as follows:

> Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise

appropriated, the sum of $100,000, said sum to be expended as follows: Not to exceed $5,000 for architectural fees and full satisfaction of all obligations in connection with the original contract between the Navy and Marine Memorial Association and the architect, and not more than $44,384 for the design, professional services, disbursements, materials, and in full satisfaction of all obligations in connection with the original contract between the Navy and Marine Memorial Association and the sculptor, and the remainder, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to be expended under the direction of the National Park Service for the completion of the Navy and Marine Memorial, in accordance with the official plans therefor as approved by the Fine Arts Commission, except that the contract proposal shall not exclude any suitable green granite or stone appropriate for that use. The National Park Service is authorized to modify the structural details if necessary, without deviating from the design.

SEC. 2. All contracts shall be on condition that the work shall be completed within one year from the passage of the Act.

SEC. 3. The National Park Service is further authorized and directed to provide adequate drives, parking space, and landscaping to provide for the enjoyment of this memorial by its visitors.

Approved, April 26, 1939. H.R. 3234, Public No. 53--76th Congress

As stated in the memorandum, it has been found that by making certain changes in the design by Harvey Wiley Corbett for the base and by using Virginia greenstone, the work can be done for $50,616, which is available. The Commission concurred in the changes proposed in the base and in the use of Virginia greenstone. (Exhibit G-1)

9. SPANISH-AMERICAN WAR MEMORIAL: Mr. Vint in company with Mr. Leo Elliott of Tampa, Florida, were in conference with the Commission concerning the proposed Spanish-American War Memorial to be erected on Davis Island at Tampa. The Commission had considered a preliminary program for the project submitted by the National Park Service. (Exhibit H) The Commission did not consider it satisfactory. Mr. Borie said he was a veteran of the Spanish-American War and he thought it was rather late to begin a project of this sort to commemorate that

event. He also said the program is very unsatisfactory since it does not specify what style of memorial building is to be erected, nor does it specify the nature of the museum and the arrangement of the exhibits; further it does not guarantee that statues and trophies for the memorial building will be actually furnished.

Mr. Elliott said that the State of Florida has appropriated $100,000 for the project and that Spanish-American war organizations from more than twenty-four states have promised to cooperate; also Congress has enacted legislation on the subject. (Exhibit H-1) There is to be quite a number of dioramas. Mr. Elliott exhibited a plan of Davis Island, which comprises 66 acres. An airport is adjacent to the memorial grounds, for which a plan is being made by A. D. Taylor, landscape architect.

In addition to the Spanish-American War Memorial, arrangements are being made to include in it a Cuban War Memorial. The memorial grounds are to be turned over to the United States Government and after completion the memorial will be maintained by the Department of the Interior. Mr. Elliott exhibited a tentative plot plan for the layout of the museum. This was discussed with the Commission. Mr. Elliott said he was glad to have the opportunity to talk to the Commission concerning the project.

The Commission felt that the plan should be given further study and perhaps by next September it will be in shape for further discussion with the Commission.

10. STANDARD HISTORICAL PLAQUE: Mr. Thomas C. Vint, Chief Architect of the National Park Service, submitted a design for a typical historical site marker. Mr. Harry Thompson of that office explained that the purpose of the marker is to commemorate historical sites throughout the Service and that the size of the marker would vary in accordance with locations selected for it. The average size of the marker would be 24 x 30 inches and could be made of bronze or wood

with painted lettering. The marker would also be of use in cases where information concerning standard markers is desired by individuals or associations throughout the country to commemorate some historical place.

The Commission after consideration approved the design.

11. GENERAL WHIPPLE MONUMENT: Mr. Vint submitted a photograph of a proposed monument to be placed in the Fredericksburg Military Park in memory of General Amiel Weeks Whipple. It was noted that funds for the monument were secured through a W. P. A. allotment and that the plaster model was made by Jeno Juzsko; the model consisted primarily of horses and rider and was poorly executed. The Commission disapproved the model. (Exhibit I)

12. ARLINGTON MEMORIAL BRIDGE STATUARY: Mr. Fraser and Mr. Friedlander were in conference with the Commission concerning the completion of the statuary for the Arlington Memorial Bridge project. Mr. Fraser said he had been giving considerable thought to the use of bronze and provided it is gilded it would be very fine. However, it would require 14 months work to make the full sized models. The question was raised whether a bronze equestrian could be produced for $43,000 (there being $171,143 available, leavin $85,571 for each pair of statues). Mr. Fraser said with $43,000 for each equestrian there would not be money left to pay for the time of the sculptor. Mr. Manship said: "As I figure it $18,000 would pay for the casting, $4,000 for gilding, with $21,000 for enlarging the group."

Mr. Fraser said there would be a great deal of machine work in making the model and the result might not be satisfactory.

Mr. Clarke asked if both Mr. Fraser and Mr. Friedlander were willing to furnish for that sum the models needed and produce the statues. Mr. Fraser replied that the statues can be done for that amount but said they would do their

work for nothing. Mr. Fraser then asked whether the use of marble would be satisfactory. Mr. Friedlander was inclined to use bronze; however, the Commission objected to one group being done in bronze and the other in marble. Mr. Friedlander was asked whether he would be willing to use marble. He replied that he would like to think the matter over another ten days. Mr. Clarke urged that Mr. Fraser and Mr. Friedlander come to some agreement with the National Park Service on the material to be used for this statuary, whether it would be marble or granite so that the appropriation will not be lost.

In conclusion Mr. Fraser suggested the use of Georgia marble. He said he could cut a group into nine pieces. The marble for each group would cost $51,000; granite would cost $38,000, but there would be extra cost for carving. Mr. Fraser did not particularly favor granite since there are so few good carvers.

The Commission finally agreed that Mr. Fraser and Mr. Friedlander produce their groups in stone, either marble or granite, and that the Commission give consideration to a definite recommendation from the sculptor in this matter. A report was sent to the National Park Service. (Exhibit J)

13. PORTRAIT OF FORMER PRESIDENT HOOVER: The Secretary brought to the attention of the Commission the following report received from Mr. Moore concerning the portrait of former President Hoover by Violet Wenner:

May 18, 39, at Gig Harbor.

Dear Mr. Caemmerer,

I have seen the Hoover portrait. It is utterly inadequate. The artist has accentuated the blemishes instead of softening them. Moreover, only an American artist should paint the portrait of a President, the Zorn portrait of President Taft to the contrary notwithstanding. The latter complained that his portrait looked too much like him!

Yours, C. M.

Further action in the matter is to be taken when Congress enacts legislation for having a portrait of former President Hoover painted.

14. OSCAR STRAUS MEMORIAL: The Secretary presented photographs of sketches by A. A. Weinman, sculptor, for statues to frame the Oscar Straus Memorial which is to be placed along 14th Street in the Great Plaza. Mr. Weinman described the sketches as follows:

The Sculptured Groups
for the Oscar S. Straus Memorial for Washington, D. C.

At the outset of the work and having in mind the ideas put forth during a conversation with Mr. William Loeb and Mr. Roger W. Straus and after some preliminary studies, I decided upon the following titles for the two groups flanking the fountain basin.

The group to the right of basin to represent "Patriotic Service". The dominant motif in this group is the seated figure of Columbia welcoming the youth who has chosen her as his mother by adoption, offering in return for her bounty, to serve her by his genius and learning.

Her outstretched hand is breaking a sprig from a bough of laurel, borne by the genius of Fame.

The group at left of fountain basin represents "Achievement". A powerful, seated figure of a mature man, "The Spirit of Achievement", forms the dominant motif of this group, his right arm resting upon the shoulders of the kneeling youth with open book, the Recording Genius of Achievement. The outstretched hand of the dominant figure rests upon a hammer crowned with bayleaves by the Genius of Endeavor, as symbol of Achievement.

This, to my mind, would fittingly commemorate the youth who as an immigrant has learned to love his adopted country, has absorbed her ways and spirit, and who in grateful recognition of the bounties he has enjoyed, has served her with distinction in public office by his dignity of character and high personal achievements.

(Signed) A. A. Weinman.

Also a letter was received from Mr. Weinman concerning the material he proposes to use for the statues. (Exhibit K)

The photographs were brought to the attention of Mr. Manship and upon his recommendation the Commission approved the models. The Commission discussed

the question of material to be used for the statues. Mr. Manship disapproved the use of bronze, saying, "If a bronze statue is on a light pedestal it is most undesirable. The bronze turns black. It is the most unpleasant combination that one can imagine. There is something that can be done about it but it is practically never done. One gets tired of seeing gilded bronze." Mr. Manship suggested aluminum but Mr. Clarke considered it a dead color. Mr. Manship also mentioned the use of lead, particularly for garden sculpture. Mr. Borie said that there are plenty of such garden sculptures in Philadelphia but another metal is used, either an alloy of antimony or bismuth, which harden the mixture. Mr. Manship said: "In 1916 I made some large lead vases that are in a garden at Pittsburgh. They have stood up beautifully as against aluminum; that is a material that has color. On the other hand you can take almost any other metal and plate it with almost any other metal. There is a way of spraying or vaporizing it by means of a gun."

Thereupon Mr. Clarke remarked: "In spite of all you say, would you not prefer stone to any of these?" Mr. Manship replied that he would prefer marble because the modeling is too fine for granite. The Commission disapproved the use of limestone. Mr. Manship said that the character of the group does not fit limestone.

Thereupon the Commission decided to recommend that the statues be executed in marble. (Exhibit K-1)

The Secretary stated that the Treasury Department has expressed its willingness to allot the space in the Great Plaza for the erection of the memorial fountain and has submitted an estimate (Exhibit K-2) for $14,500, which it is proposed to have appropriated by Congress at this Session, to pay for excavation and a few other initial expenses.

15. NEW ENTRANCE TO FORT BELVOIR: The Secretary presented a set of designs made by Major General Julian L. Schley, Chief of Engineers, War Department, for a set of new entrance gates to Fort Belvoir on U. S. No. 1, two miles south of Mount Vernon. The question raised by General Schley was whether the gates should be 300 or approximately 500 feet from the highway. The Commission inspected the design. It was noted that there is to be a relocation of the roadway in front of the reservation and also a low wall to enclose it from the highway. The Commission felt that this was a problem for a landscape architect and referred the matter to Mr. Clarke with power to act. Mr. Clarke was not satisfied with the designs presented and requested the Secretary to secure an architectural drawing of the elevation and also a structural drawing. These will be furnished by General Schley.

16. PAINTINGS FOR THE NEW INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING: Under date of June 7, 1939, Mr. Edward Rowan, Assistant Chief of the Division of Fine Arts, Treasury Department, submitted the following letter with sketches:

Dear Mr. Clarke:

Reference is made to the proposed mural decorations in the Recreation Room, 8th floor, New Department of the Interior Building, by four American Indians.

Attached are a group of color sketches by Mr. Woodrow Crumbo for the south entrance, a group of photographs of designs by Mr. Allan Hauser for the north and east walls, main room, a group of photographs of designs by Mr. Gerald Nailor for the south and west walls, main room and a group of photographs of designs by Mr. Velino Herrera for the serving entrance.

It will be appreciated if these designs and photographs may be reviewed by the Commission of Fine Arts and the comments and advice presented to this office.

Very cordially yours,
(Signed) Edward B. Rowan,
Assistant Chief,
Section of Fine Arts.

The colored sketches were brought to the particular attention of Mr. Savage, who inspected them and upon his recommendation the Commission approved them. Mr. Savage said the artists are to be highly complimented for their work and in this the Commission concurred. (Exhibit L)

17. PHARMACY BUILDING: Mr. Edward Barrington, architect, submitted a revised design for the Riverside Pharmacy at 2125 E Street, N. W., to consist of a one story building instead of two stories and to be built of limestone.

Mr. Lamb in behalf of the architect members of the Commission made certain changes in the facade, which were indicated in the drawing, such as simplifying the parapet and making the glass windows in the doorways rectangular. Subject to these changes the Commission approved the design.

18. STATUE OF JOHN MARSHALL, RELOCATION: The Secretary presented a copy of H. J. Res. 260, introduced by Representative Brewster of Maine, proposing the relocation of the Statue of John Marshall, which is on the west side of the Capitol, on the Supreme Court Building grounds; the bill is as follows:

> Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Architect of the Capitol is authorized and directed to move the statue of John Marshall from its present site on the Capitol Grounds to a new site either on the grounds of the Supreme Court Building or on the Capitol Grounds between the Capitol and the Supreme Court Building. Such new site shall be selected by the United States Supreme Court Building Commission.
>
> SEC. 2. There is authorized to be appropriated such sum as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution.

The Commission considered the matter and decided that while the Commission had heretofore recommended that the statue be relocated on John Marshall Place, arrangements could be made to place the statue on the Supreme Court Grounds.

Mr. Clarke recommended placing the statue on the pavement at the south entrance of the Supreme Court Building where the statue would face south and be in an important location on East Capitol Street.

Later in the evening, Mr. Manship and Mr. Shepley, accompanied by Mr. Caemmerer, inspected that location. Mr. Manship decided, Mr. Shepley concurring, that it would be much more appropriate to place the statue of John Marshall in the central hallway, which is 30 feet wide and 30 feet high, at the entrance to the Supreme Court Building.

A report was sent to Congressman Brewster advising that the Commission of Fine Arts would not object to the relocation of the statue of John Marshall on the Supreme Court Building grounds provided it be replaced by an adequate statue of George Washington on the west terrace of the Capitol. (Exhibit M)

19. PARKING AREA FOR AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT: Mr. Kline, Landscape Architect of the National Park Service, submitted a plan proposing the establishment of a parking area at the east end of the East Wing of the Department of Agriculture Administration Building. The Commission inspected the plan and disapproved it.

20. FREER GALLERY: The Chairman designated Mr. Shepley and Mr. Manship, with power to act, to inspect certain objects of art proposed for purchase by the Freer Gallery of Art. Accordingly, Mr. Shepley and Mr. Manship made the inspection during the afternoon. The objects were primarily Chinese bronzes and Persian and Indian manuscripts and were highly appreciated. The purchases were approved. (Exhibit N)

The Commission adjourned at 6:00 p. m.

C O P Y

June 13, 1939.

Dear Miss Mayhoff:

Referring again to your letter of May 4, concerning the silver coffee urn owned by Thomas Jefferson at one time, I am pleased to inform you that I brought this matter to the attention of the Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting on June 9.

The Commission recommend that the urn be brought to the attention of the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Foundation and that it be placed in Jefferson's home at Monticello. The Jefferson Memorial Foundation is located at Charlottesburg, Virginia.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very truly yours,

(Signed) Gilmore D. Clarke,

Chairman.

Miss Amelia L. von Mayhoff,
17 East 89th Street,
New York, N. Y.

EXHIBIT A

C O P Y

June 9, 1939.

Dear Sir:

Your letter of June 3, concerning the proposed painting depicting the Signing of the Constitution, has been received.

I am enclosing a copy of the letter sent by the Commission of Fine Arts to Speaker Bankhead on the subject. From this you will observe that the Commission of Fine Arts was in favor of holding a competition for the painting.

Yours very truly,

(Signed) Gilmore D. Clarke,

Chairman.

Mr. Arthur Emptage,
National Executive Secretary,
American Artists' Congress,
100 West 13th Street,
New York, N. Y.

EXHIBIT B

May 2, 1939.

Hon. W. B. Bankhead
The Speaker's Rooms
House of Representatives
Washington, D. C.

My dear Sir:

The Commission of Fine Arts are very much interested in the provisions of House Joint Resolution No. 224, providing for a painting to portray the signing of the Constitution to be located in the Capitol.

I have taken up the subject of your letter of April 28th, in particular with the painter member of the Commission, Mr. Eugene Savage and take pleasure in presenting the names of certain mural painters who we are confident are competent to do full justice both artistically and historically to the subject of the painting. We respectfully recommend for consideration by your Commission the following:

Henry Meyer of Indianapolis, Indiana.
George Harding, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
James O. Mahoney, Dallas, Texas.
Reginald Marsh, New York City.
John Steuart Curry, Westport, Connecticut.

All of the above named have placed among the highest in government competitions for mural paintings held under the auspices of the Branch of Painting and Sculpture, Procurement Division, Treasury Department. The Commission feel that anyone of the above named merit your thoughtful consideration.

The Commission suggest the possibility of holding a national competition to be judged by a jury of prominent mural painters. The government competitions which have been held during the past few years have been eminently successful and have been a means of discovering men and women of outstanding talent.

The Commission of Fine Arts stand ready to be of assistance to your Commission and if it is your pleasure, we should be glad to take up this matter with you in a meeting at which the Chairman and the painter member might represent the Commission of Fine Arts.

Cordially yours,
(Signed) Gilmore D. Clarke,
Chairman.

GDC:R

June 13, 1939.

My dear Mr. Wyeth:

The Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting on June 9, 1939, considered the sketches which you submitted for the new Public Library to be built along Pennsylvania Avenue between Fourth and Sixth Streets. The Commission had before them a print of the Pennsylvania Avenue elevation showing a long projection of the building. The Commission felt that this projection is not only too long, when considered in its relation to the rest of the facade, but also that it requires simplification; the Commission have indicated on the plot plan the approximate limits they consider pleasing. The Commission would be pleased to see a drawing in accordance with these recommendations for consideration at the next meeting of the Commission on June 23.

The Commission understand that your drawing showing this long projection was made pursuant to a recommendation of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission and that such projection is desirable for a distance back 26 feet from the curb so as to extend the present building line east as far as possible on Pennsylvania Avenue. The Commission are strongly of the opinion that the location of the Library Building is one that will not materially affect future buildings west of Sixth Street and consider it more important to provide a projection of the Library Building in a manner to be in pleasing proportion to the building itself.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) Gilmore D. Clarke,

Chairman.

Mr. Nathan C. Wyeth,
Municipal Architect,
District Building,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT C

C O P Y

June 12, 1939.

My dear Mr. Barton:

The Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting on June 9, 1939, were pleased to inspect preliminary sketches for buildings of the Washington National Airport. It was understood that this was an informal submission and that a complete set of building plans for the project will be submitted to the Commission of Fine Arts later.

However, in the meantime the Commission wish to recommend that the buildings be designed as low as possible. Also the Commission recommend that the buildings be located so as not to obstruct the view of the Washington Monument as one drives along the Mount Vernon Highway from Alexandria to Washington.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) Gilmore D. Clarke,

Chairman.

Mr. LeRoy Barton,
Supervising Architect,
Procurement Division,
Treasury Department,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT D

MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
HELD IN WASHINGTON, D. C., JUNE 23, 1939

The eleventh meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts during the fiscal year 1939 was held in its office in the Interior Department Building on Friday, June 23, 1939. The following members were present:

Mr. Clarke, Chairman,
Mr. Borie,
Mr. Shepley,
Mr. Lamb,
Mr. Manship,
also H. P. Caemmerer,

Secretary and Administrative Officer.

The meeting was called to order at 10:30 a. m.

1. WAR DEPARTMENT BUILDING: At a joint session with the National Capital Park and Planning Commission consideration was given to a revised design and model for the new War Department Building, submitted by the Supervising Architect's Office, Treasury Department. Mr. Foster and Mr. Underwood of that office submitted studies showing the treatment proposed by adding a sixth story to the first setback. They said it is proposed to remove the mechanical equipment from the sixth floor and place it on the seventh floor at the setback level and make office space of the 6th floor, thus providing a windowed six story height facing the street. Various studies suggesting different height levels were submitted.

At the meeting of the Commission on June 9, the suggestion was made to raise the height of the first setback in order to get greater space between the windows and the parapet. Mr. Nolan said: "If that is done, the 7½ foot limit set by the National Capital Park and Planning Commission is increased that much more and one more story is provided in excess of any other government building in Washington. The land on which this building will be located is higher than that of any other site for any other Government Building."

The omission of windows from the penthouse was noted and it was thought this improved the appearance of the building.

A discussion arose concerning air conditioning equipment and it was pointed out by the architects that it is very important that all the air conditioning apparatus be on the same floor. This brought up the question of relationship of the facade facing the east with the long facade facing C Street. It was decided to eliminate one story of the south half of the building facing C Street so that the cornice line along the east side and south side of the building would be of uniform height. It was noted that the length of the facade along C Street between 21st and 23rd Streets measures 500 feet. The entire building has a length of 1,200 feet as against 1,046 feet for the Department of Commerce. Mr. Simon said it is proposed to use limestone throughout the exterior since there are no interior courts. It was finally agreed that the Commission of Fine Arts in passing upon the architectural phases of the proposed building should proceed on the basis that the Park and Planning Commission has approved the height.

Mr. Clarke said the Commission of Fine Arts would not favor increasing the height limit beyond 7½ feet. The Park and Planning Commission will recommend to the Procurement Division that they omit one story from the south hall of the War Department Building facing on C Street.

In the afternoon the Commission discussed aesthetic questions pertaining to the design with several of the representatives of the Supervising Architect's office. Mr. Foster showed from the model that he had reduced the height of the central penthouse by four feet. Mr. Lamb recommended that the wall in front of the pilasters facing east be brought forward one stone width, that is, about 5 feet.

Mr. Manship discussed the question of sculpture for the building. He felt the building needs some ornament over the entrance. Mr. Lamb said the sculpture might relieve the barrenness and the repetition of the pane sized windows and the same spacing of windows but, he said, "I do not think you achieve interest by piling on a lot of ornament. It is the relation of masses that counts." Mr. Foster pointed out that the windowless condition at the right of the entrance to the headhouse was due to the presence of a vault and a similar condition at the left of the entrance was due to guard rooms.

Mr. Manship said: "I think it would add to the appearance of the east entrance to treat the area around the door with sculptural ornamentation. An historical frieze in high relief would be highly appropriate.

Thereupon on motion properly moved and seconded, it was decided to approve this model, subject to some changes in detail and to the inclusion of a sculptural frieze.

The question of flagpoles for the building was discussed and the Commission decided that instead of having one flagpole at the main entrance provision might be made to use the three blocks of stone over the entrance which had been suggested for statues, as indicated in the design, and use them for the bases of three flagpoles. A report was sent to Colonel Barton. (Exhibit A)

2. NEW NAVY DEPARTMENT BUILDING: Both Commissions discussed at length the proposed new Navy Department Building as proposed in legislation H. R. 6050 introduced by Representative Vinson, Chairman of the House Committee on Naval Affairs, as follows:

A BILL

To authorize the construction of new buildings for the Navy Department in the District of Columbia

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That pursuant to the provisions of the Public Buildings Act approved May 25, 1926 (44 Stat. 630), as amended, the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to acquire within the area included in squares 10, 11, 12, S-12, 20, 21, and 22, in the District of Columbia, a site, and to construct thereon a building or buildings for the Navy Department, including, in addition to the necessary staff and office buildings, a museum, underground garage, ship berthings, and the relocation of Potomac Drive, and including connecting tunnels, the extension of steam and water mains, removal or diversion of such sewers and utilities as may be necessary, under a total limit of cost of $23,466,000 and the previous total limit of the authorizations for the purchase of land and the construction of buildings in the District of Columbia, prescribed under the Act of May 25, 1926, and the amendments thereto, is hereby increased by the amount of the limit of cost herein authorized.

There are hereby authorized to be appropriated the necessary sums to carry out the above project within the specified limit of cost.

Mr. Foster, Architect of the Procurement Division, submitted elevations for the proposed Navy Department Building, showing the War and Navy Building elevations on the same north and south line, with C Street carried through the Naval Hospital development, and a permanent Board Building between the two. Plans were also submitted showing grade conditions at the Hospital grounds and the proposed E Street mall development. The design suggested placing the Navy Department Building south of E Street and west of 23rd Street. If the mall (E Street) is cut through the hill, two stories will be underground.

Mr. Partridge offered studies and models of the Navy Department Building scheme and explained them as follows: "The first alternate would be to maintain the hill and carry E Street through and locate the Navy Department Building north of E Street, with a certain amount of terracing. This plan would block the park extension to the west of the Naval Hospital grounds.

The second locates the Navy Department Building south of E Street, but carries the park treatment through to the river, but with an external ship basin.

The third alternative shows the park carried to the Naval Hospital grounds, with the Navy Department Building facing the basin, with a museum to the west.

The fourth is a suggestion by Charles Eliot for a park treatment on the east, stopping at the Hill, the hill preserved, and a pool or lagoon provided.

The museum in all cases intrudes on the park area. It is necessary first to determine the shape of the pool, the position of the ships, retention of the hill, and the blocking or continuance of the park extension in the line of E Street.

A discussion of the subject included the question of whether the ships could be set in concrete and maintain water in the basin at a low level to be used as a reflecting basin; whether flood conditions in the river must be taken into account in connection with the ship basin; a suggestion that the water level in the basin be 10 to 20 feet higher than the river to take care of flood conditions; preference for imbedding ships in concrete on the edge of the basin; the possibility that if the ships are anchored at this point, it will necessarily mean a congestion of traffic for persons coming into the down town area by the parkway route; consideration of obstruction of the view of Roosevelt Island; preference of the Navy Department for anchoring the ships in the river; possibility of terminating the mall treatment on E Street at 23rd Street; suggestion of Mr. W. A. Delano that instead of changing the contour of the hill, that the building might be designed around the hill; the fact that if the hill is cut down to accommodate the building, it will mean that several stories will be without light and practically underground; the feeling of Mr. Shepley that the Navy Building should be an economical and good working building and his opinion that it is not necessary to remove the hill to locate the building at this site, that the site above E Street is considered very good because it is not necessary

to interfere with the hill, and his very strong feeling that the building should not be built down on the line of Constitution Avenue and too near the Lincoln Memorial, and that if it is located there, it will look very badly in relation to the Memorial. As to the parkway, it does not appear necessary to go into that question now because it can be altered or located as desired after the development is completed.

Further discussion included the fact that the nature of the planting around the present Naval Hospital is of a temporary character because it is intended only to screen out the temporary buildings. Mr. Nolen suggested that a study be made of the naval museum, developing the idea of a promenade in front of the Navy Department Building overlooking the area to the west for the use of the Secretary. There was possible objection to a separate building for the activities of the Secretary of the Navy because he would not wish to be separated from his other activities. The suggestion of the President for a general council building between the two groups for conferences between the two Secretaries was considered. Mr. Shepley felt that the most practical plan is the one placing the Navy Building backed on the river front such that any part of the hill disturbed in the building operations could be suitably terraced with the termination of the park treatment at 23rd Street; that if the building is constructed into the side of the hill, about three stories would be lost, and such construction would not be economical.

Mr. Clarke stated that he felt it is a shame to take down the only natural "lump" in this flat area, and that it would be a mistake to cut the hill down; that in his opinion it is bad planning to admit that removal of the hill is the only way a plan can be carried out, and it is his opinion the hill should be retained.

A motion was unanimously carried that the two Commissions jointly proceed, in connection with consideration of the plans for the Navy Department building, predicated on the idea of retaining the hill.

Mr. Clarke said that in any plan so formal as the one under consideration, it would be very undesirable to have a hump between the two buildings; that from the surface of E Street between 23rd and 24th Streets, the sight line is 60 feet above the ground level of 20th Street; that E Street has a gradual rise in grade westward from 19th Street; that there is a material difference in any plan that would locate a large building at the top of the hill instead of a small building; that from the view across the river, this development would be the most conspicuous in the whole city; that it would not be desirable to create another north and south axis, and that the axis for the whole composition should be east and west; that the two squares north of E Street should be acquired to prevent the construction of large apartment houses facing on this group, and also provide for future expansion.

It was agreed that the main portion of the Navy Department Building should be on the axis of E Street at 23rd Street. (See copy of bill as amended by the House. (Exhibit B))

A report was sent to Representative Lanham. (Exhibit B-1)

5. WASHINGTON AIRPORT: Mr. W. E. Reynolds, Assistant Director of Procurement, submitted a small model of the airport development. Mr. Reynolds pointed out that all the hangars had been placed on the south side of the airport development (namely on the side towards Alexandria). Six hangars were shown in the scheme but only two are to be built now. The Commission favored the location of the hangars there rather than on the Washington side of the airport development. The hangars will measure 225 feet in width by 175 feet in depth and about 50 feet in height. They will have segmental roofs with concrete ribs, the

bodies built possibly of aluminum. Mr. Reynolds said that the two hangers will provide for 12-13 planes whereas the Washington Airport has accommodations for seven planes at the most now.

The Commission discussed the relocation of the Mount Vernon Highway. It was recommended that the test track of the Bureau of Public Roads Laboratory be placed parallel to the highway. The importance of providing proper planting for screening the highway was suggested. It was said there are 200 feet between the railway boundary and the dirt track.

The Commission discussed the models for the airport with Mr. Reynolds and Colonel Barton in the afternoon. Col. Barton submitted an architectural study for the administration building, which showed a large waiting room facing the runways. There will be a dining room on the northeast side looking towards Washington.

Mr. Clarke raised a question whether the Bureau of Public Roads was satisfied with the scheme as presented. The statement was made that no representative of the Bureau of Public Roads was present at either the morning session or the afternoon session but it was stated that the schemes had been worked out in consultation with the Bureau of Public Roads. Mr. Clarke felt it was important, in view of the interests of the Bureau of Public Roads in the locality, that the airport scheme that will be adopted will be satisfactory to them. A report was sent to Mr. Reynolds. (Exhibit C)

4. NEW DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA LIBRARY: Mr. Nathan C. Myers, Municipal Architect, submitted a rendered drawing showing a projection for the D. C. Library Building between the Fourth and Sixth Street boundaries on Pennsylvania Avenue. Mr. Myers said he was submitting two designs, one with a projection of 200 feet, which the Commission of Fine Arts had disapproved at a meeting held

June 9 and one which has been drawn in accordance with the recommendation of that Commission, namely, a projection of about 150 feet in length. Mr. Wyeth said he would like to have the question of length of projection settled so he could proceed with the final design for the building. Mr. Bolen said the reason the National Capital Park and Planning Commission had recommended the long projection was in order not to restrict the width of the buildings on the squares west of Sixth Street.

Mr. Clarke said the Commission of Fine Arts must consider a design of a building in relation to itself and the long projection is out of proportion to the rest of the library building.

The National Capital Park and Planning Commission finally agreed that the central projection of the building should be approximately 150 feet in length and that this would be left to the discretion of the Commission of Fine Arts in passing upon the design of the building.

At the afternoon session the architect members of the Commission discussed various phases of the design with Mr. Wyeth. The question was raised as to the width of the pilasters. The architect members felt they would not want to tell Mr. Wyeth how wide the pilasters should be. They did not want to design the building for him.

Mr. Wyeth explained from a drawing how he wanted to show a relatively small central portion and wider wings and not to introduce small windows. Mr. Clarke said the Commission of Fine Arts would not write a letter to him but since the question of length of the 150-foot projection had been settled, the Commission would be glad to inspect a design in due time, drawn by him in accordance with the agreement reached as to length of the projection.

5. ALBERT GALLATIN STATUE: Mr. Louis Simon submitted a complete design for the pedestal of the Albert Gallatin Statue. The Commission felt the design to be satisfactory but criticized the pebble platform and felt it would be preferable to use stone. Mr. Clarke said that in the old days workmen had time and patience to set the pebbles properly. Mr. Borie agreed and said that unless they are put in right the frost gets in and the whole thing becomes loose. It was finally decided to leave this matter to the discretion of Mr. Simon and Mr. Fraser. (Exhibit D)

6. MARCONI MEMORIAL: The secretary presented a blueprint for the pedestal of the Marconi Memorial together with a set of specifications. (Exhibit E) These had been received from Mr. Samuel Dibalco, secretary of the Marconi Memorial Association. Mr. Borie and Mr. Mowbray gave the design particular attention and were in conference with Mr. Bruce of the D. F. Manning Company concerning the matter, this firm having been asked to submit a bid for the erection of the memorial.

Mr. Bruce filed a letter in which he set forth a number of important criticisms of the design calling attention to defects in the drawing and submitted also a proper construction plan. His letter reads as follows:

June 23, 1939.

My dear Mr. Caemmerer:

In regard to the granite work for the Marconi Memorial, plans and specifications of which have been submitted to us, may we suggest the following changes:

Granite:

The specifications calls for Somme Sound or Milford Pink granite, the grains of quartz and feldspar to be one quarter inch or

under. This is almost impossible and to select stock of such size as necessary for the work to meet this requirement would make the work excessively expensive. We would recommend Stony Creek granite as an alternate.

Finish:

The specifications call for a honed finish throughout. We would recommend that the treads of the steps and platform be fine axed finished, as honed finish on these surfaces would very soon show scratches that would be unsightly.

Foundation:

A reinforced concrete foundation is specified and shown on the plans. If the nature of the soil of the location and its bearing permits, we would suggest a mat foundation under the entire memorial which would cost approximately the same and be more substantial.

Construction:

A few errors of dimensions are on the plans but in substance the idea is conveyed and our recommendation is for its improvement without affecting the design.

The platform should be of solid block 17'6" long by 8'0" wide by 1'7" thick, instead of three pieces as shown and particularly without the 4" centerpiece which in our estimation would be insufficient to assure good construction. The Pedestal for the bust will weigh five (5) tons and should not be allowed to bear on as thin a slab as this. Even though properly bedded there is every possibility of rupture from a fracture in setting.

The two unprotected joints on the platform would be a source of constant maintenance and become unsightly in a few years.

All vertical joints should be rabbetted at least 2" to prevent damage from water getting behind and freezing.

A drawing covering our suggestions is enclosed.

Yours very cordially,
THE J. F. MANNING COMPANY INC.
By (Signed) Eric A. Bruce)
Manager.

Mr. Bruce particularly objected to the four-inch thick slab to hold a five-ton block of stone. Mr. Bruce also urged one slab of stone rather than

three, saying that there would be perhaps not more than 10% difference in cost and recommended the use of Stony Creek granite. Both Mr. Doris and Mr. Hensley agreed to this. It was agreed that the risers of the steps be polished but not the treads nor the platform.

The Commission discussed the matter and agreed to the criticisms made by Mr. Bruce. These were embodied in a letter sent to the Marconi Memorial Association. (Exhibit F) In this letter a request was also made for a draft of the inscription.

The secretary presented a copy of a letter (Exhibit G) sent by Secretary of the Interior Ickes to the Marconi Memorial Foundation, asking the Foundation to be prepared to furnish a bond preparatory to the erection of the memorial on the reservation at 16th and Harvard Streets.

7. STEPHEN T. MATHER MEMORIAL: Mr. Kline, Landscape Architect of the National Park Service, submitted a design for a memorial plaque which is being offered by local citizens for erection adjacent to the Rock Creek Parkway, near the William H. Taft (Connecticut Avenue) bridge. They have $2,000 in hand for the project. Mr. Kline said the plaque is similar to plaques that have been erected to the memory of Mr. Mather in various National Parks in this country.

The Commission considered the design. Mr. Clarke felt that the memorial is highly inadequate for erection in the National Capital to commemorate the great services to the Government rendered by Mr. Mather in developing the National Park Service. The Commission agreed with Mr. Clarke in this matter and disapproved the design. (Exhibit H)

The Commission adjourned at 5:30 p. m.

C O P Y

June 29, 1939.

My dear Colonel Barton:

In connection with the design for the War Department Building, the Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on June 23, 1939, decided that it would improve the appearance of the headhouse to have sculptured relief over the entrance. An historical frieze in high relief would make this impressive.

Also, the Commission recommend that the wall in front of the pilasters over the main entrance be brought out one stone joint approximately five feet and that the three blocks of stone over the entrance, indicated in the design, and at one time considered for pedestals of statues, be used for three flagpole bases.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) Gilmore D. Clarke,

Chairman.

Colonel LeRoy Barton,
Supervising Architect,
Treasury Department,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT A

76TH CONGRESS } HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES { REPORT
1st Session } { No. 1024

TO AUTHORIZE THE CONSTRUCTION OF NEW BUILDINGS FOR THE NAVY DEPARTMENT IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

JULY 1, 1939.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. LANHAM, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 6830]

The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 6830) to authorize the construction of new buildings for the Navy Department in the District of Columbia, having considered the same, reports favorably thereon with amendments and recommends that the bill as amended do pass.

The amendments are as follows:

Page 1, lines 6 and 7: Strike out "included in squares 10, 11, 12, S–12, 20, 21, and 22" and insert in lieu thereof "lying south of F Street Northwest, between Twenty-third Street and the Potomac River."

Page 1, line 5, strike out the words "Secretary of the Treasury" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Federal Works Administrator."

Page 2, line 8, at the end thereof change period to comma and insert the following:

Provided, That appropriate designs only may be secured by competition, or otherwise, on conditions to be determined by the Federal Works Administrator.

Page 2, line 11, at the end thereof change period to comma and insert the following:

and in addition thereto the cost of the competition, including one or more awards for any design or designs which may be accepted and the compensation of a jury of award.

The purpose of the bill is to authorize the construction of new buildings for the Navy Department in the District of Columbia to meet an urgent demand for new quarters because of a greatly expanded naval program placed upon it by the recently inaugurated naval defense activity creating a lack of sufficient space and making less efficient

86106—39

Union Calendar No. 422

76TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 6830

[Report No. 1024]

A BILL

To authorize the construction of new buildings for the Navy Department in the District of Columbia.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia

JUNE 14, 1939

Referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds

JULY 1, 1939

Reported with amendments, committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and ordered to be printed

C O P Y

June 29, 1939.

My dear Mr. Lanham:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at a meeting held jointly with the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, gave careful consideration to the bill, H. R. 6830, To authorize the construction of new buildings for the Navy Department in the District of Columbia.

In the location of the new Navy Department Buildings it will be necessary to harmonize them with existing public buildings in the Northwest Rectangle as also with the new War Department Building assigned to that area; also unusual topographic conditions make the location of the new Buildings for the Navy Department one that will require careful study. Therefore, it would be preferable not to restrict their location to specific squares as stated in the bill. In connection with this project there is also the matter of the practicability of berthing ships along the Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway.

In view of the above, the Commission of Fine Arts recommend, and in this the National Capital Park and Planning Commission concur, that the wording of the bill be so changed as to make it possible to locate the new buildings for the Navy Department anywhere in the area between E Street and Constitution Avenue, Twenty-third Street and the river.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Hon. Fritz G. Lanham,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Sincerely yours,
(Signed) Gilmore D. Clarke,
Chairman.

EXHIBIT B-1

June 29, 1939.

Dear Mr. Reynolds:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on June 23, 1939, inspected the preliminary small scale model of the Washington National Airport, which you submitted. The Commission are of the opinion that the general scheme as broadly indicated is satisfactory, subject to the development of the details to include the grading of the site, the location and arrangement of the Mt. Vernon Memorial Highway and connecting roads, the location of buildings, hangars, and other structures.

Since the Bureau of Public Roads is also vitally concerned with the development of the area, by reason of (1) their occupancy and control of a portion of the site designated for airport use by the Civil Aeronautics Authority and (2) because they planned and built the Mt. Vernon Memorial Highway, the Commission of Fine Arts urges that, insofar as possible, the requirements and suggestions of that agency of the government be met, particularly with respect to the features having to do with vehicular circulation and the amenities pertinent to the same.

While the Commission of Fine Arts voiced no objection to locating the hangars southwest of the proposed Passenger Terminal and Administration Building, the action taken is predicated upon the submission of detailed studies to show the treatment of the site, more particularly to include the grading necessary to effect the scheme indicated upon the model.

The type of design for the proposed hangar met with the approval of the Commission.

The design for the proposed passenger terminal and administration building prepared by architects under Mr. Simon's and Col. Barton's direction, was considered by the Commission to be in the right direction; the Commission concurred in certain suggested changes which tended toward a further simplification of the facade facing the landing field. Studies for this same structure, prepared by your consulting architects, were disapproved.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,
(Signed) Gilmore D. Clarke,
Chairman.

Mr. W. E. Reynolds,
Assistant Director of
Procurement,
Treasury Department,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT C

C O P Y

June 26, 1939.

Dear Mr. Simon:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on June 23, 1939, approved the design which you submitted for the pedestal of the statue of Albert Gallatin, to be erected on the north side of the Treasury Department Building.

Criticism was made concerning the pebble pavement, as shown in the design. The Commission felt it would be preferable to use stone. However, the Commission decided to leave this matter to the discretion of your office and Mr. Fraser, sculptor of the memorial:

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) Gilmore D. Clarke,

Chairman.

Hon. Louis Simon,
Supervising Architect,
Treasury Department,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT D

SPECIFICATIONS FOR A MONUMENT TO MARCONI

Attilio Piccirilli - Sculptor
Joseph H. Freedlander - Architect

Specification Brief

GENERAL CONDITIONS -

The General Conditions as set forth by the American Institute of Architects are a part of this Specification.

EXCAVATION -

The Contractor shall visit the site and assume all responsibility for the condition thereof and must perform all excavation required to construct the monument including: excavation of earth androck and its removal from premises; providing backfill around foundation work; excavation and removal of earth within the property lines sufficient to meet established grades for final planting or sodding grass; all shoring, bracing, piling, etc., obtain all permits; furnish all tools and supplies; protect all existing work about the site of whatever nature; furnish all backfill required after foundations receive Architect's approval.

CONCRETE WORK -

Contractor shall visit site and assume all responsibility for the conditions thereof.

Work included comprises all labor and materials necessary for all concrete or reinforced concrete work.

All work should be done as noted on drawings and shall consist of one part Portland Cement, two parts Sand, four parts Broken Stone.

Forms shall be made of tongue and grooved lumber.

Reinforcement shall be as indicated on the drawings and concrete placed in forms shall be thoroughly puddled. No concrete work shall be done in the rain or freezing weather.

In hot weather concrete shall be wet down twice daily for the first week. Concrete shall be thoroughly set before removal of forms.

GRANITE WORK -

The Contractor shall visit the site and assume all responsibility for the condition thereof.

The Contractor shall furnish all labor and materials necessary for completion of all granite work as called for on the drawing.

The Contractor shall submit setting drawings, showing the method of jointing, bonding, etc.

All granite work shall be cust and quarried under conditions that will not conflict with the usual trade practices.

All other stone shall be hard, durable, sound and of uniform quality texture and strength, well seasoned, free from quarry sap and impurities. All stone shall contain no defects.

The Contractor shall state in his bid the name of stone and quarry upon which his proposal is based.

All granite shall be uniform in texture and shall be "Dowan Pound" or "Milford Pink" in accordance with sample in the Architect's office.

Grains of quartz and feldspar shall not exceed one-quarter of an inch in diameter.

All granite is to be of an enduring quality, virtually non-absorbent and to show no deterioration from weather and atmospheric conditions.

All granite shall be delivered to the site when required and shall be protected from contact with the ground.

All granite shall be accurately cut as to lay on its natural quarry bed. All granite shall extend at least 4" below grade.

All granite shall be in sizes as indicated on the drawings.

All granite shall receive a fine honed finish.

This Contractor to finish all dowels and anchors, cut holes necessary for same, also to provide all anchors necessary for secure setting of bronze sculpture to be executed by Attilio Piccirilli. All anchors or dowels shall be bronze.

SODDING AND PLANTING -

The Contractor shall examine the site and assume all responsibility for the conditions thereof.

This Contractor is to supply all tools and equipment and labor necessary for the sodding and planting of the plot.

Sub grade shall be 1' (one foot) below finished grade.

Top soil shall be good quality free of all objectionable matter with a 1/8 mixture of rotted manure.

All grading shall be done as to dra away ll surface water from the site of the monument.

All seeding and planting shall be done under a separate contract.

C O P Y

June 29, 1939.

Dear Mr. DiFalco:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on June 23, 1939, considered the design, with specifications, which you submitted. The Commission have several important recommendations to make:

The platform should be of solid block, 17 feet, 6 inches long by 8 feet wide by 1 foot 7 inches thick, instead of in three pieces as shown. The 4-inch thick center platform piece, shown in the design, is insufficient to insure good construction, since it is understood that the pedestal for the bust will weigh approximately five tons. Even though the thin stone be properly bedded, there is every possibility of a fracture in setting.

Also, the two joints on the platform unprotected from weather would be a source of constant maintenance and would become unsightly in a few years. All vertical joints should be rabbetted at least two (2) inches to prevent damage from water getting behind and freezing.

The specifications call for Somes Sound or Milford Pink Granite, the grains of quartz and feldspar to be one quarter inch or under. It is almost impossible to select stock of such size to meet this requirement and would result in making the work excessively expensive. The Commission of Fine Arts therefore strongly recommend the use of Stony Creek granite.

The specifications call for a honed finish throughout. While there is no objection to giving the risers of the steps a honed finish the treads of the steps and platform should be fine axed finish, as honed finish on these surfaces would very soon show scratches that would be unsightly.

With reference to the foundation, a reinforced concrete foundation is specified and shown on your plan. If the nature of the soil of the location and its bearing permits, the Commission would suggest a mat foundation under the entire memorial, which would cost approximately the same and be more substantial.

It appears that the plan you submitted, presumably prepared by your architect although not signed nor identified in any way, was made in a hurry, since there are several evident errors. It would seem

EXHIBIT F

advisable, therefore, and in view of the recommendations of the Commission of Fine Arts above stated, to have a revised design for the pedestal made by the architect, and to amend the specifications accordingly. To assist you in this matter we are enclosing a construction plan, prepared by J. F. Manning Co. of Washington, D. C., whom you asked to submit a bid for the work.

We shall look forward to receiving a print of the revised design of the pedestal, and copy of the specifications corrected and amended as suggested for final approval.

Also, please submit for approval the draft of the inscription that is proposed for the pedestal, after which full sized details of the lettering will be required.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,
(Signed) Gilmore D. Clarke,
Chairman.

Mr. Samuel DiFalco, Secretary,
The Marconi Memorial Foundation,
270 Broadway,
New York, N. Y.

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

Washington

June 22, 1939.

Mr. Generoso Pope,
President, Marconi Memorial Foundation, Inc.,
30 Rockefeller Plaza,
New York, New York.

My dear Mr. Pope:

I have received your letter of May 20, regarding the erection of a memorial to the late Guglielmo Marconi on the site approved by the National Commission of Fine Arts located at 16th and Harvard Streets, and designated as United States Reservation 309-C, of this city.

As it is proposed to construct this memorial under the supervision of the National Park Service of this Department, the Director of that Service should be furnished with a set of contract drawings showing the plans for foundation construction and landscaping. Subsequent to a study of these plans and a determination of the entire costs of the Memorial and its setting, and before a permit can be issued by this Department, your Foundation will be required to furnish a bond in order to insure the completion of the Memorial within the five year period and without cost to the United States as required by the provision of Joint Resolution No. 86, 76th Congress, approved April 13, 1939, which authorized its erection.

Sincerely yours,
(SGD) HAROLD L. ICKES
Secretary of the Interior.

EXHIBIT G

July 11, 1939.

Dear Mr. Demaray:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on June 23, 1939, considered a design submitted by Mr. Kline, Landscape Architect, of your office, which local citizens are offering as a memorial to Stephen T. Mather in the National Capital. It is proposed to erect the memorial adjacent to the Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway near the William H. Taft (Connecticut Avenue) Bridge. Mr. Kline said the plaque is similar to memorial plaques that have been erected to the memory of Mr. Mather in various National Parks throughout the country.

The Commission, after consideration, decided that the plaque would be inadequate for erection in the National Capital as a memorial which would properly commemorate the outstanding services of Mr. Mather to the Government in developing the National Park Service. The Commission, therefore, disapproved the design.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) Gilmore D. Clarke,

Chairman.

Hon. A. E. Demaray,
Acting Director,
National Park Service,
Department of the Interior,
Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT H